

**DRAFT**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**NORTHWEST-PROGRESSO-FLAGLER HEIGHTS**  
**REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE**  
**8<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**  
**May 8, 2018 – 3 :00 P.M.**

**Cumulative Attendance**

**May 2017- May 2018**

<b><u>Members Present</u></b>	<b><u>Attendance</u></b>	<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Absent</u></b>
Ron Centamore, Chair (Phone)	P	9	1
Leann Barber	P	10	0
Alan Gabriel	P	9	1
Rhoda Glasco Foderingham, Vice Chair	A	8	2
John Hart	A	6	4
Mickey Hinton	P	5	5
John Hooper	P	7	3
Dylan Lagi (arrived at 3:21 p.m.)	P	9	1
Steffen Lue	P	9	1
Christopher Murphy	P	3	0
Diane Randolph	A	5	2
Scott Strawbridge	P	10	0
Tina Teague	P	10	0
John Wilkes (arrived at 3:16 p.m.)	P	7	3

**Staff**

Vanessa Martin, CRA Business Manager  
 Sandra Doughlin, NPF-CRA  
 Robyn Chiarelli, Director of TMA  
 Alan Budde, Planner  
 Bob Wojcik, Housing and Economic Development Manager  
 Eleni Ward Jankovic, Project Coordinator  
 Jaimie Opperlee, Prototype-Inc.

**I. Call to Order/Roll Call**

**NPF CRA Chair**

Chair Centamore called the meeting to order at 3:13 p.m. and roll call was called.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

**NPF CRA Chair**

- April 10, 2018

**Motion** made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Hooper, to approve the April 10, 2018 minutes. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**III. Project Updates**

**(a) Funding Update**

**Vanessa Martin,  
Business Manager**

Ms. Martin referenced a new spreadsheet and noted that the projection is that there will be about \$1.6 million left at the end of FY 2018 as long as those funds were not encumbered.

Ms. Barber questioned the plan.

Ms. Martin indicated that there was not a plan at this point but they are trying to see what projects can get started before the end of the fiscal year, which would be brought to the Board for a recommendation.

**(b) Project Status Update**

**NPF CRA STAFF  
COREY/BOB**

See next item.

**IV. Discussion  
Capital Improvement Projects**

**Bob Wojcik,  
Housing &  
Economic Dev.  
Manager**

Mr. Wojcik mentioned the capital improvement project sheet, which are sheets of open CIP projects that have been funded. Many of these projects are near completion and some are complete, which means the unspent fund balances need to be transferred to other CIP projects. The question is how to spend the \$1.5 million of unspent funds that was put in the operating budget for incentives. Mr. Wojcik went through the list and noted which projects have been funded and the status of the projects, as well as some of the various CIP initiatives discussed last year prior to this group.

Mr. Wojcik mentioned the following projects:

- Fat Village corridor improvements. The project is on hold because in 2013 roughly \$300,000 was put in and another \$300,000 in 2014 and the project has been in preliminary design. The estimated cost of construction would be \$1.5 million plus another \$360,000 for design. That project has not moved forward. Because the project has been there for so long, the money most likely will have to transfer out of the account. Improvements developed for the Fat Village Streetscape between Sistrunk Boulevard and NW 5<sup>th</sup> Street along NW 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and NW 5<sup>th</sup> Street, east of the tracks were mentioned. Only a small amount of money was spent in planning. There is an unspent balance of \$583,000 and the cost of the project is \$1.5 million plus design. The project cannot be done without at least another \$1 million or \$1.3 million. There has been discussion among the major property owners of modifying the design to something different based on what is currently happening in the area. This group may come back for future funding but the project will most likely be closed out and reconsidered at a future date.

Ms. Martin commented that the project has not progressed because it was decided not to move forward.

Mr. Wojcik stated there were not enough funds in the project.

Chair Centamore mentioned that since these projects came before this group years ago, basically the whole east side of NW 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue has been accumulated by a company. It was questioned if all the existing buildings are torn down and rebuilt if the company would get to rebuild that side of the street

and take it away from City costs. There is a lot to consider on this project prior to any funding being done.

- CRA wireless cameras. This came before the Board last year and the Police explained that there were 17 cameras plus five or six more forthcoming. That project is still in the works. The remaining budget balance is \$120,000. It has been indicated that more money is needed and that the project was originally funded in 2013.
- NW 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue enhancement project. The City funded \$800,000 in 2013 and another \$1.2 million in 2014 for a total of \$2 million. FDOT also put in \$800,000. That project is not complete pending final charges. There is currently an unspent balance of \$785,000, a portion of which will most likely be transferred to another project.

Mr. Strawbridge stated that the project was completed with almost \$3 million and now it is completely torn up; it is still under construction as the road is blocked and there is excavation involving a new roadway.

Mr. Wojcik indicated that the construction was not part of the project; it is separate with regard to some of the infrastructure down the street.

Mr. Strawbridge thought it might be a good idea for the CRA and other departments to check with each other prior to moving forward with a project. It makes no sense that a new \$3 million investment is done and three months later another department tears of the work. The area has been torn up for over a year and it was only open a couple of days before it was barricaded and bulldozed. There are six-foot deep excavations, machinery, and road closures, but it says we are done. This project is not done; it is being demolished.

Mr. Wojcik reiterated that it is a separate project.

Mr. Lue questioned if the \$700,000 was accounted for in the \$1.7 million or if that was an addition.

Mr. Wojcik advised that the \$700,000 was money left over less other pending charges. A good majority of that money will be available. Each project is a separate CIP project so there are leftover balances in various CIP projects.

- Off-street parking was mentioned. Originally three parking lots were planned; two approved by the Commission; one on 12<sup>th</sup> and one on 19<sup>th</sup> at Sistrunk Boulevard. Those two projects together were estimated at roughly \$500,000 in addition to design fees, permitting and construction.

Mr. Wojcik stated that the reason there was so much money, \$2.9 million, was because originally \$250,000 was put in this project in 2014. Last year, there was an unspent fund balance from the operating budget that was set aside for incentives that needed to go somewhere and it had to go into a CIP project. The same situation may occur this year if there is an unspent balance in the operating budget for incentives, which would have to go into a CIP project.

Mr. Wilkes questioned if the money was allocated to build parking garages.

Ms. Martin did not think that was justifiable. The funds were put there because funds were available at the time.

Mr. Wilkes hoped that \$2.9 million was not approved to build parking garages.

Mr. Wojcik indicated that once it is determined what the parking lots need, which is roughly \$500,000 to \$700,000 plus design fees, the remaining fund balance would have to be transferred into another CIP account.

Mr. Wilkes commented that the unspent balance could be \$2.2 million or more.

Mr. Wojcik advised the reason this is being discussed is to know what kind of monies in the CIP would be left over for other CIP projects.

- BCIO Flagler Village improvements. This was funded with \$132,000 in 2013 and \$200,000 in 2015. In addition, there was \$25,000 from General CIP contributions. There was a balance of \$93,000 left over and these funds were used for street signs.

Mr. Lagi mentioned there were also monuments and questioned if that was still in the unspent funds.

Mr. Wojcik did not know if the monuments were included but he knew the street signs were included.

Mr. Lagi questioned maintenance, as there will be other hurricanes and disasters, and he believed this should be a general budget item.

- Carter Park Renovations were funded with \$250,000 in 2014. There were also a lot of upgrades to Carter Park that do not currently exist. That project is complete and there is a small balance of \$622.

Mr. Murphy questioned if it would be possible to add additional columns in addition to the unspent balance.

Ms. Martin stated when this was previously discussed an overview was given of status.

- Lighting at Provident Park. This project was funded at \$167,000 in 2015. It provides for 21 LED lights; however, no lighting currently exists. There may not be a fund balance in this project; the PO was for \$156,000 from the contractor.
- NW 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue Connector. This project is no longer a project; it was removed from the MPO list of projects. Other funds from other sources allocated to this project have been reallocated to other projects. The City contribution was \$14,480.
- NW Neighborhood Improvement. This project was three phases, starting with \$1.73 million from CRA in 2011 and 2013 plus another \$774,000 from State and Federal funds. The first phase was completed in 2012; the second phase was completed in 2015, and the third phase was completed in 2015. The first phase was streets north of Sistrunk Boulevard between 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and then along 6<sup>th</sup> Court to 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue north of Sistrunk Boulevard. The second phase was between 13<sup>th</sup> Terrace and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue between 6<sup>th</sup> Street and 7<sup>th</sup> Street and the third phase was between 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Sistrunk Boulevard from 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue to 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue. These streets have new sidewalks, new solar lights, curbing, and on-street parking. That project still has an unfunded balance of \$437,624. No future phases were planned; therefore, that money would have to be validated.

- Progresso Neighborhood Improvements. This project was funded with \$997,000 in CRA funds from 2013 and 2016. In addition, the project received \$644,000 in Block Grant funds, another \$300,000 in Federal and State funds, and \$379,000 from the General CIP fund. That project is complete and there is \$1 left.
- Business Capital Improvement Program; Midtown Business Association Streetscape. This was a small project that focused on NW 4<sup>th</sup> Street. It included \$14,801 from the General CIP fund and a contribution match of \$15,000 from the CRA to the Midtown Business Association for sidewalk work and other minor improvements along NW 4<sup>th</sup> Street, just west of NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- River Gardens Sweeting Monument. This was a Public Works project. This was funded as an NCIP project at \$35,000 in General CIP funds plus a \$35,000 match from the CRA, which provided for a monument. There are currently two monuments along Sweeting and this would be the third monument. That project is still in the works because of various issues that still need to be addressed.
- NCIP River Gardens Perimeter Wall. This project was funded as an NCIP project at \$35,000 from the General CIP and a \$35,000 match from the CRA in 2014. The project is complete and the wall has been put up; it is a solid wall. The money is being returned to the CRA and to the General CIP because it was not spent.
- Flagler Village Community Garden. This project never got off the ground primarily because the property was sold and there was no longer a project. There was an agreement with Flagler Village Community Garden. They could come back at a later point if desired if they came up with another community garden that was an eligible project under the CRA Plan.
- Prior Park Senior Center. This project received \$176,000 in 2014 and another \$1.2 million in 2015 from the CRA. There is roughly \$2,000,075 available. The project is estimated to be completed in 2020; work is currently in the design phase.

Mr. Strawbridge mentioned renovations of the project and questioned how a \$2 million Senior Center was proposed without any discussion or presentation to this Board. There has never been any indication to the community that this project was under way other than political promises made to church ladies. Mr. Strawbridge questioned why this project is being done at all if it is not in the plan. He questioned where it says in the redevelopment plan that millions of dollars were going to be spent on building a Senior Center. Mr. Strawbridge is not against the seniors; however, he is against this type of unilateral taking of money for political favors.

Mr. Wojcik stated that parking permits are an eligible cost.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned where it is in the plan.

Mr. Wojcik advised that it is under the Quality of Life projects under Public Parks, Section 8.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned if the plan says a Senior Center is going to be built at Carter Park.

Mr. Wojcik indicated that the plan does not get that specific; he believed it only mentions public improvements at parks.

Mr. Strawbridge emphasized that this project has never been discussed by the Advisory Board and, in his opinion it has not been addressed in the redevelopment plan and does not appear to have been led by any form of community engagement that anyone at this table was aware of. It would appear as though it was somehow led by others than the typical government's process that was brought forward, budgeted, put into play, totally around this Board and in defiance of the redevelopment plan. Mr. Strawbridge objected to the process and thought it was illegal and unethical. He believed the Board should know the Senior Center.

Mr. Wojcik advised that \$376,000 was funded in 2014 and \$1.2 million in 2015.

Mr. Strawbridge noted without any public discussion.

Ms. Martin questioned if they are building.

Mr. Wojcik stated that they are working out the public comments.

Mr. Strawbridge indicated that his recollection in talking to the Parks Director was that the Parks and Recreation Department did not want to do this project.

Mr. Hinton mentioned that the first time he heard about this was four or five days ago. Mr. Hinton believed the Center Park renovation is necessary and noted that something is needed at that park including more parking spaces.

Mr. Wilkes commented that this is one of several projects the Board has not properly seen or vetted and it is not appropriate to be included in the budget.

Chair Centamore agreed.

Mr. Strawbridge advised that he was in support of improvements at Carter Park; they are needed. The point is that there has not been an adequate public process to support this proposed expense.

- Dorsey Riverbend. This was originally proposed as a purchase of property to construct a small park monument to the Founders of Dorsey Riverbend. The project has changed to a monument project that would be funded at a location that is already a park location, preferably Provident Park. Mr. Budde believed that the Board heard this presentation a while back.
- Sistrunk Enhancement. This project provides for many different things including relocating a transmission line that comes from the sub-station going north to Sistrunk Boulevard and goes through a redevelopment parcel. It also provides for undergrounding some of the other FP&L lines on the south side of Sistrunk Boulevard and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue going all the way to the railroad tracks. The cost recently generated by FP&L to relocate the transmission line that passes through the property was \$1.3 million. There is currently a little over \$2 million available in the budget.

Mr. Wilkes mentioned the \$49,000 on the 11849 Dorsey Riverbend Monument and questioned how much would go back into the account since it could not be used due to the fact it was going to an existing park.

Mr. Wojcik advised that was unknown at this time.

Mr. Wilkes referenced Item 12096, underground utilities, and questioned when this came about and when it was approved.

Mr. Wojcik advised that was part of the five-year plan approved last year.

Ms. Martin indicated that capital projects have a three-year threshold. Once funds have been allocated, if there is no activity, the money must be sent back to the taxing authorities; legally the funds cannot be reallocated. As Mr. Spence stated at the last meeting, this was just to provide a summary of the capital projects that were available; most of them are interested but he proposed coming to the Advisory Board to see what type of projects or initiatives the Board would like to take.

Mr. Wilkes mentioned that based on the Commission activity with the WAVE, there is another \$7.5 million check and questioned when that was coming back. There are a lot of dollars coming back and he has seen correspondence as to what should be done. There are funds; however, places have not been found to adequately put them to fulfill CRA obligations. Putting utilities into a project that failed to be successful has not undertaken obligations under a contract of residential use; building parking garages is not the Board's job. Mr. Wilkes believed they were going in the wrong direction. Last year, the Board suggested giving something for the people who live here. A great job has been done of redevelopment of the eastern portion of the CRA and now the funds are being given back to where we qualify. Mr. Wilkes commented that there is probably \$11 million sitting around that could be used to do something and believed they were failing. Mr. Wilkes advised that he has a real problem with the allocation but understood there are reasons because the money has to be protected. Let's put the money to work.

Ms. Barber indicated that there has been repeated discussion about the kinds of programs the Board would like to see but she did not see the mechanism within the CRA management to generate those programs. Home improvement programs have been discussed and \$1,000 and \$2,000 grants could easily be obtained. Ms. Barber questioned why nothing happens.

Mr. Wojcik stated that funding smaller projects are staff intensive and sometimes just as much staff time is used on a small project that can be spent on a large project. There is a big issue trying to spend money. Over the last year there were discussions about NW 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Sistrunk Boulevard, and Sunrise Boulevard. This was discussed as a potential project to continue NW 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue improvements. There has not been an application for grant funding but there has been some type of Workshop meeting with the neighborhood. The question becomes if they should wait to see whether this project is ever funded by FDOT or some other source or if they should decide to fund it themselves. Another project discussed was about sidewalk and crosswalk improvements for Walker Elementary leading children to and from the school. That project did not receive grant funding for the last two years and again, the question was if they should wait for it to get funded and get a match, which was over \$100,000 for design services. Waiting for grants to get approved is a long tedious process and there is not that much time. The Mobility Master Plan was discussed last year and several neighborhoods have already completed theirs; however, it has not been done for Dorsey Riverbend, Home Beautiful or River Gardens. If that were in place, a road map could be created for the rest of the public improvements within the CRA. It was his understanding that they were trying to put that into the budget for next year but again, a consultant must be hired to do that work. We must decide to fund this ourselves if the grants are not coming through.

Mr. Murphy understood wanting to do fewer larger projects as far as staff administration time and being able to allocate large chunks of funds but it did not seem like that would push the money because of the process involved. Perhaps there is a way to shift the paradigm a little and see if a

new program could be created; something new that would allow smaller amounts to be disbursed in a more efficient or faster way across the community.

Mr. Wojcik stated that a modification of an incentive program was recently presented to the CRA Board and there would be discussion to see if that would work.

Ms. Teague questioned what is being done to bring people in to see how they can get funding since that is no longer being done. She mentioned a large project with 10 to 12 lots that has not moved yet. Ms. Teague questioned the homes; new roofs, impact windows, or hurricane shutters, that would help homeowners.

Mr. Wojcik indicated that those proposals would come before this Board. The program was presented to the CRA Board and approved about a year and a half ago. The improvement program was improving houses within the neighborhood and would start with new houses would be built. Currently, there is nothing in the budget for housing rehab. It is anticipated that there would be monies for housing rehab in the future.

Mr. Wilkes commented that there is money and it needs to be moved where it needs to go. Home ownership is a very important element of success in the neighborhood and there is a very small percentage of homeownership. We should incentivize that acquisition and perhaps provide mortgage assistance, such as 20% down.

Mr. Wojcik advised that there is a down payment assistance program that is tied to the lots they sell and homes that are being built.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned if that was an open project for someone else to buy a piece of property.

Mr. Wilkes stated there was an idea to expand and the other was if \$7.5 million was being taken from WAVE dollars. He questioned if CRA money could be used to maintain, buy, or acquire types of jitneys to help provide the missing link to get people to jobs. That provides an opportunity and is some benefit. We should be supplanting our dollars for general fund expenditures.

Ms. Barber mentioned housing and noted that the mission is to reduce slum and blight. She knows a lot of people living in abysmal housing conditions and thinks there should be some incentive program for renters to get a small grant to fix up their own place or for landlords. The reality is that there is a small percentage of owners/occupants. The needs of people should be addressed as it exists today. A \$500 grant could reduce some of the blight and improve the quality of life in the neighborhood.

Chair Centamore was not in favor of bailing out a landlord who collects rent. Our incentives are helping homeowners who must be homesteaded and live in the property.

Mr. Murphy believed if the CRA were to put up the opposite of landlords who own 80%, a split could be done with the landlords of 20/80 to reduce some of the blight in the neighborhood.

Chair Centamore commented that \$75,000 is given to people who own homes.

Mr. Strawbridge stated that there is no rehab money available through HCD; there is very little assistance. We did manage to put enough money in the affordable housing trust fund to build a triplex, maybe a quad, and maybe a duplex for Fort Lauderdale. He questioned how the \$800,000 set aside would solve the housing crisis. He did not understand how this community would be

sustainable when the CRA sunsets without a better approach towards affordable housing for the work force. He is always surprised to see how little this agency is willing to do coupled with how little our City's will is. He is concerned about these numbers if roughly \$7 million in holding accounts have been moved around to avoid our obligations under the law. The plan has never been updated and a list of all the projects that have been done in the last five years has never been received. The CRA Director told him if he wanted that he would have to go to the auditor, which is wrong. He questioned what has been done in the last ten years and how much money has been taken in and put out, and what was built. The Board has approved dollars for projects that never got done and the money was shifted around. Affordable housing is not being built. It was noted that we got two new breweries but we will not subsidize a renter.

Chair Centamore was not in favor of subsidizing landlords who let their people live in "squalor". He would rather see these people buy a home. Chair Centamore mentioned the breweries and noted that only one was funded. There are a lot of conditions before any funds are received and that will be part of an overall bigger project. It was mentioned that other businesses were funded, such as a man who sells guitars and repairs antique vehicles.

Mr. Lue mentioned education programs such as back to work and employment training.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that Jack and Jill may come here seeking to expand to 5<sup>th</sup> grade.

Mr. Lue stated that money could be used for different agencies to implement a program for the community to help educate and eliminate the slum and blight.

Ms. Barber recalled that about a year ago there was going to be a Workshop with the Commission to discuss all the different projects that could be proposed and that never happened. She plants at Community Gardens and advised that they could provide employment, as well as health and food. Her concern was not so much the individual things not being done but the process.

Chair Centamore believed that the Commission was planning a Workshop with this Board within the next two months. None of their programs have reached the community.

Mr. Lue questioned who is responsible from the CRA to advertise what is out there.

Chair Centamore stated that a staff person is needed for that. Perhaps the City needs to hire someone for such a position.

Ms. Martin commented that approval was granted to hire a strategic communications specialist in 2019. The position is of a marketing nature.

Mr. Lue questioned if that person would be going out to the community and if that is in their job description.

Ms. Martin stated it was; it is of a marketing nature. Whenever the person is hired, Mr. Spence has the authority to give them a plan of action.

Mr. Lue questioned if the Board would have any input with the plan of action.

Ms. Martin was sure Mr. Spence would welcome any feedback, options and ways that incentives can be improved.

Mr. Wilkes commented that it is easier to spend larger sums on smaller projects based on limitations of staff and the complexity of the application. This is a critical time and communication should go to the Commission regarding a joint Workshop. He thinks there will be \$7 million here plus \$7 million that should technically be put back in the budget before the end of this fiscal year. There must be an allocation of those funds for a program and since everyone is saying they do not think there are adequate programs in place to do what needs to be accomplished, then more need to be created and in place to fund before September 30, 2018; the sooner the better. There must be a housing element and Mr. Wilkes believed that is essential to preserve existing neighborhoods.

Ms. Barber mentioned the website and the description for the Residential Rehabilitation Forgivable Loan. It was noted that the language presented was not something that a homeowner would be able to read and understand; it is a very technical document and is written for a developer or someone like that.

Chair Centamore believed that this Board needs to meet with the CRA Board and have a joint meeting to lay out some of the ideas. In the meantime, perhaps staff could write something about that.

**V. Funding Request  
(a) Sun Trolley**

**Alan Budde,  
Planner**

Mr. Budde advised that a funding request was submitted in the amount of \$261,000 for NW neighborhood routes and the downtown link routes for Sun Trolleys. They are working on other funding sources from the County and FDOT and if they get those amounts that amount would go down approximately \$60,000 to \$90,000 so it would be as low as \$170,000. For the past six to eight months an outreach process has been conducted in the neighborhoods with the community to talk about the two routes that serve the area and some changes were proposed.

Robyn Chiarelli, Executive Director of the Downtown Fort Lauderdale Transportation Management Association, indicated that they operate the Sun Trolley on behalf of the City of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, FDOT, and a number of their other funding partners.

Mr. Budde provided a brief Power Point presentation.

- Two proposals were proposed. The main difference was whether there was more service on Sistrunk Boulevard or more on 4<sup>th</sup> Street and Broward Boulevard between the two routes.
- The second proposal was to continue down 4<sup>th</sup> Street and Broward Boulevard instead of more service on Sistrunk Boulevard.
- To date, about 60% to 65% of the people were in favor of the first proposal on Sistrunk Boulevard and about 35% to 40% were in favor of the second option.

Mr. Wilkes questioned how much it costs to ride.

Mr. Budde advised that it is free; there is not a fare. That is something to look at but they want to be careful about impacts that could be caused by charging a fare.

Ms. Barber questioned how closely they work with Broward County Transportation in terms of their bus pass working for them and vice versa.

Mr. Budde stated they work closely with and receive funding from Broward County. Currently, they get about \$280,000 per year. Broward County bus stops are used as well. They do not have signage but that is something they want to discuss with them to get permission. In the past, Broward County has not been too favorable of signage at the bus stops so they are going to work on that. There probably would not be any revenue received using the County bus passes but it might be a logical way to extend transportation options.

Mr. Wilkes noticed that a link was eliminated south of the river; it went to the courthouse before. He questioned if that was under-utilized or if they were looking at something else to fill that need.

Mr. Budde indicated it was under-utilized. The downtown link route that runs about every 20 minutes goes up and down 3<sup>rd</sup> and Andrews Avenue. It is largely accessible via that route as well as other Broward County routes so in terms of trying to make the route more efficient, ridership did not merit keeping that end.

Mr. Wilkes commented that if riders wanted, they could get off and transfer to another bus.

Mr. Budde replied yes, another bus is accessible via transfer.

Mr. Wilkes mentioned recent studies regarding parking and reduced parking requirements for developments in the northeast area and questioned what affect that might have on ridership.

Mr. Budde thought that would be beneficial. Usually ridership and transit is higher density areas; it is difficult to forecast how that would affect ridership. The price of gas is one of the biggest factors as is population density increases. Mr. Budde thought the availability of excess parking would reduce ridership and parking.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that the funding request was the same this year and questioned if there was much of a difference in the amount of distance traveled in the routes and if they are shorter or longer.

Mr. Budde stated that the route is physically a little longer. The proposal for the northwest, which has the highest ridership, has one bus that goes a full day and one way is a peak only bus. The proposal would be to move the hours around to make it two full busses during the day so the headway would be estimated at about 45 minutes all day. That would be an improvement over the time of the day currently where there is only one bus, which runs about an hour and 20 minutes during the off-beat time.

Ms. Barber questioned the neighborhood link.

Mr. Budde advised that the neighborhood link is a little hard to compare. The proposal would be for one bus to run every hour; currently there are two vehicles and the hours are 8:15 a.m. to 2:15 p.m. The route is much longer so the two busses work out to similar headways. The time is currently about an hour and 40 minutes so there would be about 15-minute headways, which should help people traveling get to where they want to go faster.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned how the headways compare to similar situations and if they are adequate. It sounds like a long wait.

Mr. Budde stated that 45 minutes is the longest headway that Broward County has. Busses across the system vary between about 25 to 45 minutes, which would be similar to Broward County but ideally, they would be more frequent. He would like to see the Transportation Plan every 30 minutes for busses.

Funding is needed and they are working with a funding shortfall at this time with cuts across the system; therefore, proposals to increase service cannot be submitted. It is believed that the northwest would merit once there are funds.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that perhaps this Board could put together a proposal. He received a text that the County Commission unanimously voted to disconnect from the WAVE project. Our agency has budgeted about \$1 million to subsidize a premium transit in Flagler Village and another \$200,000 to subsidize transit west of the railroad tracks. They are committed and was not that it should all be spent. In his opinion, these headways should be improved and ways should be found to create more connectivity to the Sun Trolley system and the Brightline. There should also be innovations not to repurpose the funds for something other than transit. Since this commitment was made the plan was amended to make it fall together. Mr. Strawbridge mentioned that a couple of UM grads started a business called Freebee who use electric vehicles to move people on Miami Beach; they have a contract in Downtown Coral Gables where there is a lot of construction. The electric vehicles are moving people from the parking garages to their destinations and keeping them from driving around the most congested parts. This is done on demand from an app and their biggest complaint in Coral Gables was a 17-minute wait time. This is a 12-hour a day service. Coral Gables is paying \$200,000 per year and the firm is supplementing that with sponsorships. Not to replace the Sun Trolley, but some of these route truncations would impact even though the 45 minutes is the same; it is a six to nine-block walk for some people where the bus goes right by them. The study looked at where the people want to go but no one looked at where the people are coming from. Mr. Strawbridge would be a strong proponent of looking at that and other types of partnerships that could also solve the problem of what is happening with people getting to the Brightline. It was questioned how to get people to the destinations in Flagler Village; they cannot go south of Broward Boulevard but maybe they could partner with someone to do that. It was noted that 11% of the people west of the tracks use transit to get to work and according to the U.S. Census, 1% of the people east of the tracks use mass transit to get to work. We have been subsidizing five times more money east of the tracks than west. Connectivity affects everyone. If the money was going to be used to do one specific thing and look across all boundaries a lot less money could be used to provide more valuable services to all the residents in the CRA, which could make a huge difference.

Chair Centamore questioned the funding request.

Mr. Budde reiterated that the funding request was the same as last year; it was \$261,000. They are in the middle of applying for additional funding from the County and FDOT. As soon as any funding requests are received they would let the Board know how much that would reduce their request. Their request, as it exists, would be the same as last year, \$261,000 and that is what they would like to request.

Mr. Gabriel heard a comment of interest about adding more services and more funding. He did not want to make a motion on the request without discussing what that consideration might be.

Mr. Budde believed they were always interests in expanding transportation options; that would be great for the City. It would be helpful to have a clear idea of what they are working with so a proposal could be provided.

Mr. Gabriel stated that one of the big issues was timing; it takes so long for a bus to go the complete route. He questioned how, in terms of time, change, and cost, if a bus were added to the route.

Mr. Budde advised that it is complicated because they are only allowed to request the CRA to fund the portion within their boundaries that would add to overall funding. Under the new proposal, the CRA would fund about 67% of the northwest route and 48% of the neighborhood route; therefore, they would have to find some matching funding from other City sources.

Mr. Gabriel questioned if it was possible to add a bus that travels within the CRA boundaries and what that would cost.

Ms. Chiarelli indicated that could come back next month. She recommended that motion be entertained, which was the \$261,612 to operate what they are proposing and they would like feedback on the one versus two for the northwest community link and then perhaps a few members would be willing to sit with her and Mr. Budde to discuss potential opportunities and what would work for the community and they could estimate how much that would cost and come back next month as a separate proposal.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that improving the levels of service would go a long way. About a year ago he asked if the Board could get involved in one of the Mobility Master Plans for the area and he is still hearing that they are waiting for money but no one heard the fact that some people would be willing to discuss the funding to do so. The City of Fort Lauderdale should ask if a Mobility Master Plan is needed to figure out how to expend these funds. Perhaps a couple of steps could be done to get them going in the short term; however, he thought a plan should be made for a short, medium, and long-term haul.

Ms. Barber thought the routes were interesting but the marketing and communication is just as important. It was noted that older kids use Uber. Ms. Barber stated that the app is not user friendly.

Ms. Chiarelli stated that the app is old; it comes down to dollars and cents. Maybe dollars could be used to improve the app.

Chair Centamore stated that could be brought back for discussion.

Mr. Murphy and Mr. Strawbridge were interested.

Mr. Wilkes commented that the City is doing a side thing, not just CRA. To be effective someone needs to attend the meeting from other parts of the City because there is a major gap in mass transit from the airport to the beach and from the airport to Downtown. They need to be at the same table; we will contribute our portion and that other people should step up as well.

**Motion** made by Mr. Wilkes, seconded by Mr. Gabriel, to approve the \$261,612 request. The **motion** passed on a roll call vote:

Ayes: Ms. Barber, Mr. Gabriel, Mr. Hinton, Mr. Hooper, Mr. Lagi, Mr. Lue, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Strawbridge, Ms. Teague, Mr. Wilkes, Chair Centamore  
Nays: None

**VI. Old/New Business**  
**Alternative Date for October 9, 2018 Meeting**

**NPF CRA**  
**Board/Staff**

Mr. Wojcik advised that the October 2, 2018 City Commission meeting was moving to October 9, 2018. Two options were provided; Tuesday, October 2, 2018 at 3:00 p.m. or Thursday, October 11, 2018 at 3:00 p.m.

]

There was a consensus to meet on Thursday, October 11, 2018 at 3:00 p.m.

## **VII. Communication to CRA Board**

## **NPF CRA Board**

Mr. Wilkes commented that the need to have a joint meeting sooner than later was discussed and to come up with an allocation of programs so the \$14 million could be spent so it would not be lost.

## **VIII. Public Comment – None.**

## **IX. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.

[Minutes prepared by C. Guifarro, Prototype-Inc.]



	Joelo Holdings	B. Wojcik		2019	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 50,000							
	GFC Enterprises LLC	B. Wojcik		2019	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 50,000							
	Builders Bargin	B. Wojcik		2018	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 50,000							
	New Hope Church	G. Hall		2018	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 50,000							
	Dan Levy	B. Wojcik		2018	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 50,000							

<b>Commercial Façade Improvement CRA091801</b>											<b>Up to 75% or 90%/\$125,000</b>		<b>\$ 722,500</b>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------	--	-------------------	--	--	--

	Aero Tech	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 7,500					\$ 331,993			\$ 390,507
	Rechter Holdings	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 7,500								
\$ 125,000	CHDS LLC ( Smitty's ) - 1134 LLC	B. Wojcik	18-0077	1/23/2018	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 125,000						
\$ 125,000	Dales Tires	G. Hall	18-0003	4/17/2018	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -	\$ 125,000							
\$ 44,493	European Auto	G. Hall	Memo	4/17/2018		0.0%		\$ 44,493							
	Rechter Holdings 913 NE 4 Ave Restaurant /Retail	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 7,500								
	Searstown Warehouse LLC	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 7,500								
	Scott Hoffman- Aero Tech Labs	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 7,500								

<b>*** BUSINESS INCENTIVES FUNDING TOTAL:</b>											<b>\$ 5,953,727</b>	<b>\$ 5,356,993</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 1,050,529</b>	<b>\$ 1,647,263</b>
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---------------------	---------------------	-------------	---------------------	---------------------

TOTAL APPROVED INCENTIVE AMOUNT	RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVES	Assignee	CAM #	CAM DATE	BASIS	% Done		Advisory Board Recommended Funding	CRA Board Approved Funding	Total \$ Approved / Encumbered for Payment to Date	Appropriated Balance		Actual (Paid)	Budget Transfer	FY 18 Remaining Funds
	<b>Residential Rehabilitation Program (Single-Family homes)</b>				<u>Up to \$55,000/\$75,000</u>						-				\$ -
	Housing	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 95,000		\$ -	\$ -		\$ 95,000			\$ (95,000)
	<b>Purchase Assistance Program (Single-Family homes)</b>				<u>Up to \$45,000/Affordability need</u>						-				\$ -
									\$ -	\$ -	-				\$ -
<b>*** RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVES FUNDING TOTAL:</b>											<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 95,000.00</b>	<b>\$ -</b>		<b>\$ (95,000)</b>

City of Fort Lauderdale Northwest Progresso Flagler Heights Community Redevelopment Agency  
 NW Progresso Flagler Heights Area Fund  
 FY 2019 Proposed Budget Summary  
 5.30.2018

Revenue Sources	Proposed FY 2019
Tax Increment Revenue (TIF)	
City of Fort Lauderdale	4,082,761
Intergovernmental Revenue	7,130,363
Other Sources	
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>\$ 11,213,124</b>
<i>Other Revenues</i>	
Miscellaneous	28,025
<b>Total Sources</b>	<b>\$ 11,241,149</b>
Expenditures	
<i>Operating Budget</i>	
Operating Expenditures	3,075,619
Ad/Marketing	52,500
Christmas Lighting/Removal	12,000
Food	2,000
Light Up Sistrunk	80,000
Finance and Housing Summit	10,000
Backyard Boogie Event	12,000
Traffic Box Wraps	20,000
Banners	5,000
Outside Legal Counsel	100,000
<i>CRA Incentives</i>	
Funds Available for Incentive Projects	7,769,030
Service Charge Police	103,000
<b>Total Operating Expenditures</b>	<b>11,241,149</b>
<b>Total Uses</b>	<b>\$ 11,241,149</b>
	-

\* Wave Loop - Unwinding. \$848,994 is not shown in FY19's budget. CRA Manager to discuss.

\* Revenue Projected - 12% growth